

1. In reference to Section L.18: Would the Government consider revising the wording of this requirement to: List any relevant contracts terminated within the past 3 years and basis for termination?

A: The language in Section L.18a remains: List any contracts terminated (partial or complete) within the past 5 years and basis for termination (convenience or default).

2. What entity/organization owns the NSPIRES system?

A: The NSPIRES system is owned by NASA.

3. Will the NSPIRES system be available for use by the incoming contractor?

A: Use of the NSPIRES system is required by the incoming contractor.

4. In reference to Clause H.6 Advance Agreement Between the Parties: Requirement to Provide Contract Historical Data (GSFC 52.242-91) and Attachment J –Contractor Historical Data: As this contract is a follow on, has NASA requested this data from the current contractor? If so, please provide.

A: This data is not available.

5. In reference to SOW Section L.15(c)(1) (Business Systems): What does the government consider as evidence of an adequate accounting system?

A: A DCAA audit report or independent auditor review determining adequate accounting system may be considered as evidence. Contractors needing assistance in developing or improving their accounting systems and procedures may request a copy of the Defense Contract Audit Agency Pamphlet NO. 7641.90, Information for Contractors. The pamphlet is available via the Internet at <http://www.dcaa.mil>. See FAR Part 31.002 Availability of accounting guide.

6. In reference to SOW Section L.15(c)(1) (Business Systems): If an offeror submits results of a review or audit as part of its proposal submission, would that be considered as sufficient evidence of an accounting system's ability to segregate and accrue costs by contract in lieu of not having a cognizant DCAA accounting system?

A: See previous answer at question #5.

7. Our understanding is that the NSPIRES system resides in a Contractor-Owned, Contractor-Operated environment. Would the government please provide the location and name of the company providing this service? Is there a requirement for a back-up to this facility? If so, would the government also provide the name of the company and its location?

A: The NSPIRES system currently resides at InfoRelay, 2290 Shaw Road Suite, Sterling, VA 20166. This location is currently leased by the incumbent contractor. A back-up facility is not a requirement of the current contract.

8. For each year of the current contract, how much has been spent on labor and on ODC's? Is this ratio expected to remain the same on the new contract?

A: Specific cost information may be available via a FOIA request at <http://foiaelibrary.gsfc.nasa.gov/>.

9. Can the past performance questionnaires be submitted electronically by email as well as in a sealed envelope?

A: Past performance questionnaires may be submitted via email, fax or sealed envelope.

10. Reference L.18 (a) Past Performance Volume, page 87. This requirement is that recent contracts have a minimum average annual cost/fee of \$2.5M within the last 3 years of the RFP release date. Will NASA consider changing the recency to no more than five (5) years ago, and \$2 million total contract value for the prime, \$1M for major subcontractors?

A: In reference to Draft RFP Section L.18(a) Past Performance Volume: the language will be revised to reflect that the requirement will be for recent contracts having a minimum average annual cost/fee of \$1M within the last 3 years of the RFP release date.

11. In reference to Draft RFP Section B.1: Does "contract award" as used in the RFP mean contract start date?

A: The contract award date reflects the date the contract is signed. The effective date is the contract start date.

12. In reference to Draft RFP Section L.18(a) Past Performance Volume, Information from the Offeror, page 87: Will NASA consider changing the wording to "The threshold for providing a list of three (3) relevant contracts (Government and/or industry) completed no more than five (5) years ago, or on-going, involving related types of effort shall be \$2 million total contract value for the prime and the threshold for the major subcontractors shall be \$1 million".

A: See previous answer at question #10.

13. In reference to Draft RFP Section L.18(b), Prior Customer Evaluations, page 89: Since fax and email are available, is a sealed envelope the only method permitted for customers to return the Past Performance Questionnaires back to the Government?

A: See previous answer at question #9.

14. In reference to Draft RFP Section L.18(a) Past Performance Volume, Information from the Offeror, page 87 and Section M.5 Past Performance Evaluation Factor, page 100: Will NASA consider allowing contracts that finished within 5 years and lowering the contract value threshold in order to better assess small businesses?

A: See previous answer at question #10.

15. Regarding accommodations for the NRESS team, will the successful Offeror be allowed/expected to assume the lease for existing office space now held by the incumbent team?

A: Each potential offeror is responsible for making determinations concerning accommodations of its work team.

16. The Synopsis states that the formal release of the final solicitation is expected in October. Is the final release still anticipated for October 2013?

A: The current planned release date for the final Request for Proposal (RFP) is on or about November 11, 2013, with proposals being due 30 days later. All changes to the schedule can be found online at <http://procurement.nasa.gov/cgi-bin/EP5/bizops.cgi?gr=D&pin=51>.

17. We feel the annual cost/fee of \$2.5 Million for the past performance requirement is a hindrance to competition. With a size standard of \$7 Million, we feel having such a stringent past performance requirement will limit the competition pool significantly. Thusly, please justify why there was such a significant increase from the last two re-competes?

A: See previous answer at question #10.

18. In reference to Clause H.6: Will NASA provide current contract data for the average direct labor costs by labor category as specified in attachment J? Or as an alternative the current rate NASA is paying for each labor category?

A: See previous answer at question #4. Current rates for each labor category will not be provided.

19. In reference to Draft RFP Section I.1 –Clause 52.215-23 Limitations on Pass-Through Charges: Will NASA consider changing the language to use the Alternate I (Oct 2009). This clause modifies the 52.215-23 to state that the “Contracting Officer has determined that there will be no excessive pass-through charges, provided the Contractor performs the disclosed value added functions”.

A: Alternate I is not applicable to this solicitation and will not be added.

20. In reference to Draft RFP Section L(a) information from the offeror: Would the government consider eliminating this requirement or as an alternative setting the requirement at \$2.5M over the POP or lower the average annual revenue to \$750K to be more in line with the small business community “typical task order awards”?

A: See previous answer at question #10.

21. Is the contractor expected to provide network and hosting support services for the NSPIRE system or is the system and NSPIRES website hosted within a NASA government data center?

A: See previous answer at question #7.

22. Who is the incumbent and what is the current staffing level by labor category and PWS area?

A: The current incumbent is Smart Global Solutions JV LLC. Staffing level by labor category and PWS area will not be provided.

23. On research about this Draft RFP, we found that the anticipated spending \$130 million. Is this number correct?

A: This 8(a) competitive procurement will result in a Single Award Cost-Plus-Fixed –Fee (CPFF), Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract with a five year ordering period with a maximum ordering value of \$130M.

24. Would this be a single award IDIQ or a multiple award IDIQ?

A: See the previous answer at question #23.

25. The NAICS code for this is 561110 for which the threshold limit is 7 million. If the spending is \$130 million could this be considered to be a multiple award IDIQ?

A: See the previous answer at question #23.

26. If awarded to a single vendor, on reaching the \$7 million spend, the awarded vendor would graduate out of 8(a) and may not be eligible further. How will this situation be handled?

A: As long as the vendor is an 8(a) at the time of award, it would not affect the new contract. However, any future follow-on solicitations, all prospective offerors must meet the size standards.

27. What is the compelling factor for such a huge contract to be issued as an 8(a) set-aside?

A: Market Research revealed 2 or more 8(a) vendors who have the capabilities of meeting the minimum requirements. In addition, per FAR Part 19.203(c), if a requirement has been accepted by the SBA under the 8(a) Program, it must remain in the 8(a) Program unless the SBA agrees to its release in accordance with 13 CFR parts 124, 125 and 126. The current contract is an 8(a) set-aside.

28. If multiple award, could the vendor submit proposal for anyone or more of the professional support services and information technology services?

A: See previous answer at question #23.

29. Can you please let us know when an industry day will be scheduled and RFP will be released?

A: An industry day will not be held for this requirement.

30. Section L of the draft RFP states that an annual cost/fee of \$2.5M of contracts over the last three years will only be considered for evaluations. We respectfully request an explanation as to why this value has gone up five fold since the last two competitions of this contract in 2004 and 2009. Would the government consider an adjustment to this requirement to make it equitable for small businesses competing for this contract?

A: See previous answer at question #10.

31. Section M of the solicitation states that for a Prime contractor's past performance to be evaluated, contracts at a value of \$2.5M per annum will be considered. This represents a substantial increase – 5 times as high as required on the last two iterations of this contract. The solicitations in 2004 and also in 2009 required past performance information on contracts of only \$500k. What is the justification for this increase in contract size?

A: See previous answer at question #10.

32. What is the government's justification for the increase in value for past performance contracts to be evaluated from \$500k (in 2004 and also in 2009) to \$2.5M. This seems to be an unfair requirement considering the \$7M size standard of this procurement. Would the government consider recommend reverting back to the \$500k or even \$1Million contract value for past performance contracts?

A: See previous answer at question #10.

33. Please reconsider the past performance evaluation criteria. This is a small business set-aside with a NAICS small business size of \$7m and you are asking for three past contracts with an average size of \$2.5m each. It would be very rare for a contractor with average revenue under \$7m to have three contracts at \$2.5m or larger.

A: See previous answer at question #10.